

# REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

## Addendum # 1



Department Of Executive Services  
Finance and Business Operations Division  
**Procurement and Contract Services Section**  
206-684-1681 TTY RELAY: 711

**DATE ISSUED:** **May 6, 2004**

RFP Title: **Facilities Management Division Work Order Tracking System**

RFP Number: **110-04RLD**

Due Date: **May 13, 2004 - 2:00 P.M.**

Buyer: **Roy L. Dodman, [Roy.Dodman@metrokc.gov](mailto:Roy.Dodman@metrokc.gov), (206) 263-4266**

This addendum is issued to revise the original Request for Proposal, dated **April 22, 2004** as follows:

1. The proposal opening date remains the same: **Thursday, May 13, 2004** no later than 2:00 p.m. exactly.
2. The sign in sheet from the **May 4, 2004** pre-proposal conference is available by contacting Cathy Betts at [cathy.betts@metrokc.gov](mailto:cathy.betts@metrokc.gov) or Roy L. Dodman at [roy.dodman@metrokc.gov](mailto:roy.dodman@metrokc.gov). This document is available as either a fax document or via e-mail. If you wish to have the document faxed to you, please include your fax number in your request.

### **The following information is provided in response to questions received:**

Q1: Please provide the number of concurrent system users.

(Continued on page 2)

### **TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR AWARD OF A CONTRACT, THIS ADDEMDUM MUST BE SIGNED AND SUBMITTED TO KING COUNTY**

**Sealed proposals will only be received by:**

**King County Procurement Services Section, Exchange Building, 8<sup>th</sup> floor, 821 Second Avenue, Seattle, WA 98104-1598. Office hours: 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., Monday - Friday**

Company Name

Address		City / State / Postal Code	
Authorized Representative / Title	Signature	Phone	Fax
Company Contact / Title	Email	Phone	Fax

This Request for Proposal – Addendum will be provided in alternative formats such as Braille, large print, audiocassette or computer disk for individuals with disabilities upon request.

- A1: Concurrent users - there potentially could be many users on the system – but with limited access. I assume that with any application there will be security controls for various levels of access. Work orders will be dispatched from a central location, but supervisors and foreman will require access to retrieve and update information. There will be superintendents/managers/administrators tracking by individual work order or in report format. As such, there could be 35 -50 people accessing data.*
- Q2: On Page 6 of the RFP, it states that the solution may be “commercially of the shelf or a hosted solution”. Is there a preferred option for those vendors that support both options? Can the other simply be included as an option with separate pricing within the same proposal (this would assume that functionality does not change with the deployment method)?
- A2: Regarding commercial vs. hosted, the proposer should provide all options with appropriate pricing.*
- Q3: Will Dye Management be retained through the selection process and implementation of the software application?
- A3: We do not anticipate using Dye in the selection process and assume that the successful proposer would be implementing.*
- Q4: The RFP requires audited financial statements. As a privately held corporation, audits are not required. As a corporate policy, we do not disclose financial or other sensitive information if it could be publicly disclosed. Is it even worth our time to prepare a response, given that we don't disclose financial information? Any other alternative?
- A4: It is the submitting Proposer's responsibility to meet the County's needs regarding proof of financial capacity and capability. The proposer may submit whatever documents they deem appropriate in order for the County to determine the Proposer's financial strength and stability. The County retains the right to request additional information as necessary. However, the County may also reject the submitted materials and find the proposer non-responsive to this requirement.*
- Q5: Is the County's Financial System (ARMS) a commercial off the shelf application or in-house developed legacy system? If COTS, can you please provide name and version release?
- A5: ARMS was purchased off-the-shelf many years ago. The original vendor of the system is no longer in business. It now functions as a customized financial system supported by King County Finance and ITS Analysts. Therefore, there is no "version" of the system to speak of. Any discussions of interfaces to ARMS would by default need input from both Finance and ITS Analysts.*
- Q6: Is the County's Payroll System (MSA) a commercial off the shelf application or in-house developed legacy system? If COTS, can you please provide name and version release?
- A6 MSA is also an off-the-shelf system. It is now owned by a company called GEAC Enterprise Solutions (the former Dun & Bradstreet). We still receive maintenance and support from this vendor, and it was recently updated for various reasons. We are currently running release HR02.15. This is the mid-year release as of 2002. We are several bulletins behind but we are in the process of getting these applied this year.*
- Q7: What is the project budget? Is the budget approved?

*A7: The project is not to exceed \$200,000, but the actual budget will depend on the proposal selected. Budget is not earmarked for the Work Order Tracking System, but we do have budget capacity.*

Q8: How many evaluation members are on the committee? What specific functions/roles do they represent: maintenance, warehouse/inventory, finance, payroll/timekeeping, technical, and so forth.

*A8: The department has tentatively identified five people to evaluate the written proposals, and these people represent all the functions above with the exception of warehouse/inventory. Also, it is possible, depending on the proposals received, that we shall conduct interview/demonstrations that may include the same and/or other evaluators, as appropriate.*

Q9: Regarding question WI-3 (Planned Maintenance) - What Maintenance Management System (MMS) is currently in use and for what functions? Can you please provide a brief overview of this interface requirement and the related business process flows?

*A9: FMD's MMS is a Microfocus COBOL PC-based system with a mainframe backend. The system was purchased from Lane County in the early 80's as a maintenance management tool for Roads Maintenance. Since then, it has been customized based on King County needs and ARMS interface requirements. King County ITS staff maintains the system. Primary functions are planning, scheduling, budgeting and monitoring planned versus actual accomplishments and expenditures based on established inventory, maintenance tasks, performance standards and effort levels. MMS is currently being redesigned, and will become a clients/server application, with connections to financial SQL Data Bases (i.e., ARMS).*

Q10: On page 13 of the RFP, the County states that direct expenses (per diem, travel, etc.) will be included in the Fixed Price Quote. Does the County seek to have these included in the consulting rates or listed separately as a lump sum amount?

*A10: The County's statement was included in the RFP to advise the proposer that the County intends to award the contract based on an overall total price, based on the requested fixed price quotes, which will be inclusive of all incidental costs, including those pertaining to travel. Any other pricing information outside of these fixed prices is not required.*

Q11: How many concurrent users are anticipated? Future growth?

*A11: See question/answer 1 above. In regards to future growth, unknown at this time but maybe double.*

Q12: How many users need training?

*A12: All current users of system would need training. Maybe train the trainer for future users.*

Q13: How does FMD want to link to the Road Department's MMS system? One time to populate the FMD system? Once in a while? One way or two way? Batch or dynamic link? Please describe the existing MMS system.

*A13: The MMS system is explained in question/answer 9 above. The system was initially set up for Roads, but we have adapted it for use by other agencies/services such as Facilities. At this time, there is no need for a link (or feed) from/to MMS from any proposed FMD system; the FMD system will be primarily exporting data to King County Financial systems (ARMS, Payroll, etc.).*

Q14: Is FMD interested in Work Planning and Budgeting, Resource Management, Asset Management, or GASB-34?

*A14: MMS performs work planning, budgeting and resource management. The Work Order Tracking system will be for Building Maintenance section. Asset Management and GASB capabilities are not within the scope of this RFP.*

Q15: Is FMD interested in GIS, Hand-held, barcode readers?

*A15: It depends on the purpose, if they support the WO Tracking system, then yes.*

Q16: On page 10, there is a listing of types of users to be trained. Do you have a user count for each of those groups? If that is not available, then a general idea of total users. The more detailed the better, but I am only looking for “order of magnitude” figures.

<i>A16: Supv/Mgrs/Proj. Mgrs</i>	<i>20-25</i>
<i>Shop Foremen</i>	<i>15-20</i>
<i>Inventory</i>	<i>2-3</i>
<i>Timekeeper/Acctg/</i>	
<i>WO Coord. Etc</i>	<i>5-8</i>
<i>Tech Support</i>	<i>3-4</i>

Q17: Can you provide me with an overview of the portfolio (office buildings comprising 1,000,000 sq ft or 150 buildings of various sizes and uses comprising 10,000,000...) The more detailed the better, but I am only looking for “order of magnitude” figures.

*A17: FMD serves tenants in over 37 buildings occupying approximately 2.6 million square feet of space – including office space, parking garages, public health facilities, jails, district courts, animal shelter and a shooting range.*

Q18: Your RFP noted openness to M/WBE. We are not a M/WBE, but have relationships with a number of M/WBE partners. Would our submission be viewed any differently (i.e., more favorably) if portions of the contract were performed by a M/WBE?

*A18: No, your proposal will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria as stated in the RFP document.*